arXiv:1606.03942v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 13 Jun 2016

Slow quantum oscillations without Fermi Surface Reconstruction in Cuprate Superconductors

P.D. Grigoriev[1,2] and Timothy Ziman[3,4]

[1] *L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, 142432 Chernogolovka, Russia*
[2] *National University of Science and Technology "MISiS", Moscow 119049, Russia*
[3] *Institut Laue-Langevin, BP 156, 41 Avenue des Martyrs, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*
[4] *LPMMC (UMR 5493), Université de Grenobles-Alpes and CNRS, Maison des Magistères, BP 166, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*

(Dated: June 14, 2016)

The Fourier transform of the observed magnetic quantum oscillations (MQO) in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ high-temperature superconductors has a prominent low-frequency peak with two smaller neighbouring peaks. The separation and even the position of these three peaks is almost independent of doping. This pattern has been explained previously by Fermi-surface reconstruction due to a charge-density wave (CDW). We propose that this pattern of MQO has a different origin and appears from the bilayer and inter-bilayer electron hopping. Such so-called "slow oscillations" appear even without Fermi-surface reconstruction and many observed features of the oscillations are explained more naturally than in the CDW interpretation.

PACS numbers: 74.72.-h,72.15.Gd,73.43.Qt,74.70.-b,71.45.Lr

Magnetic quantum oscillations (MQO) provide a traditional and powerful tool to study the Fermi surface and other electronic structure parameters of various metals.[1–3] In the last decade, following their first observation in cuprate high-temperature superconductors,[4] they have been extensively used to investigate the electronic structure of cuprates, both hole-doped ([5] and references therein) and electron-doped ([6] and references therein). Magnetic oscillations in Fe-based superconductors have also been extensively studied in recent years[7–13]). The most surprising data are probably those obtained in the underdoped ytterbium barium copper oxide (YBCO) compounds $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ ([4, 14–21] reviewed in [5, 22, 23]). The Fourier transform of these quantum oscillations has a prominent peak at frequency $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ with two smaller shoulders at $F_\pm = F_\alpha \pm \Delta F$, where $\Delta F \approx 90T$. All these frequencies are much smaller than the frequency F_β, expected for the original Fermi surface (FS). Many different theoretical models have been proposed to explain such a set of frequencies ([26–30], reviewed in [5, 22, 23]). While these interpretations vary in details, such as the inclusion of the spin-orbit or Zeeman splitting, they are all based on Fermi-surface reconstruction due to the periodic potential created by a charge density wave (CDW). A weak, probably fluctuating, CDW order has been detected in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ compounds by X-Ray scattering [32–34] and by nuclear magnetic resonance [35, 36]. Static CDW order does indeed lead to Fermi surface reconstruction but only if the CDW potential is sufficiently strong. More precisely, the CDW energy gap must be larger than the magnetic-breakdown gap $\Delta_{MB} \sim \sqrt{\hbar\omega_c E_F}$,[2] where $\hbar\omega_c$ is the cyclotron energy, *i.e.* the separation between the Landau levels (LLs), and $E_F \sim 1$eV is the Fermi energy of the unreconstructed electron dispersion. The oscillations in cuprates are measured in magnetic fields $\boldsymbol{B}$ higher than 30 tesla, where $\Delta_{MB} \gtrsim 40$meV is rather large and a fluctuating CDW ordering may not be enough to form new frequencies with amplitudes sufficient for experimental observation. Note that a frequency pattern somewhat similar to that of $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ is observed in the closely related stoichiometric compound $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$,[37–39] where there is no indication of a static superstructure. If FS reconstruction really is the origin of the observed F_α, F_+, and F_-, these frequencies should depend strongly on doping, which should change the big unreconstructed FS, and then give a strong relative variation of the size of small reconstructed pockets. Such a strong doping dependence is, in fact, observed in the electron-doped cuprate superconductor $Nd_{2-x}Ce_xCuO_4$,[24, 25] where the frequency changes by 20%, from 290 to 245 T, when the doping level changes by 2%, from 0.15 to 0.17 (see Fig.4 in [25]). In contrast, in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ the observed doping dependence of the three low frequencies is rather weak (see Fig.4 in [16]). Several interpretations of the observed oscillations have been proposed based on FS reconstruction where the three close frequencies seen are explained by adjusting the four available parameters: bilayer, interlayer, spin-orbit and Zeeman splitting, [5, 22, 23, 26–30] but all share the same drawback - they also predict further nearby frequencies that are not observed. To explain this apparent inconsistency, a model of compensated FS pockets has been proposed,[18], but again the expected doping-dependence remains problematic. In this paper, we propose a simple alternative picture, which is consistent with the observed three equidistant magnetic oscillation peaks in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ and other less obvious features of the measurements.

The unreconstructed FS of YBCO consists of one large pocket, almost a square with smoothed corners, that fills about one half of the Brillouin zone and would correspond to a large frequency $F_\beta \sim 10^4$ tesla. The observed frequency $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ corresponds to a FS cross section of only 2% of the Brillouin zone. Analogous "slow oscillations" (SlO) have been observed in organic superconductors and attributed not to new small FS pockets,



FIG. 1: A Fermi surface pocket with interlayer warping due to $2t_z$ and double bilayer splitting, corresponding to dispersion in Eq. (2) for $t_z\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) \approx const$, and (a) $t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) = t_\perp(1 + 0.3\sin 4\phi)$ and (b) $t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) = t_\perp(1 + 0.5\sin 2\phi)$.

but to the interplay (mixing) of two close frequencies $F_\beta \pm \Delta F$, where the frequency splitting ΔF is due to FS warping, originating from the interlayer electron transfer integral t_z.[41] As a result, magnetoresistance (MR) oscillations with a new frequency $F_{slow} = 2\Delta F = 4t_z B/\hbar\omega_c$ arise. The amplitudes of the emergent slow oscillations may be even higher than than those of the oscillations with the original frequencies $F_\beta \pm \Delta F$, because the SlO are damped neither by temperature nor by long-range disorder (variations of E_F along the sample on the scale much larger than magnetic length).[41, 42] The latter feature is especially important, because even in high-quality monocrystals of organic metals this long-range disorder makes the major contribution to the Dingle temperature.[41] In the notoriously inhomogeneous cuprates this type of disorder is much stronger than in organic metals and magnetic oscillations from closed pockets should be strongly damped, while the proposed slow oscillations are insensitive to this type of disorder.

In contrast to the organic metal β-(BEDT-TTF)$_2$IBr$_2$ with simple quasi-2D layered crystal structure, where the SlO may originate only from the FS warping due to k_z electron dispersion[41], the YBCO compounds have bilayer crystal structures. There are then two types of interlayer hopping: (i) between adjacent layers separated by distance d within one bilayer, given by the transfer integral $t_\perp = t_\perp(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel)$, and (ii) between adjacent equivalent bilayers separated by distance h, given by the transfer integral $t_z = t_z(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel)$, where $\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel$ is the intralayer momentum. The resulting electron energy spectrum is given by (see, e.g., Eq. (6) of Ref. 27)

$$\epsilon_\pm\left(k_z, \boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) = \epsilon_\parallel\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) \pm \sqrt{t_z^2 + t_\perp^2 + 2t_z t_\perp \cos\left[k_z\left(h+d\right)\right]}. \quad (1)$$

For $t_z \ll t_\perp$ this spectrum contains bonding and antibonding states separated by $\sim 2t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)$, each with weak k_z dispersion:

$$\epsilon_\pm\left(k_z, \boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) \approx \epsilon_\parallel\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) \pm t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) \pm 2t_z\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\cos\left[k_z\left(h+d\right)\right]. \quad (2)$$

The corresponding Fermi surface pocket is shown schematically in Fig. 1 for a slight tetragonal modulation of $\epsilon_\parallel\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)$ and two different symmetries of $t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)$. In YBCO there are thus at least two types of splitting of the original frequencies: the larger bilayer splitting $\Delta F_\perp = t_\perp B/\hbar\omega_c$, where $t_\perp = \left\langle t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\right\rangle \neq 0$ and the angular brackets signify an averaging over in-plane momentum $\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel$ on the FS, and the smaller splitting $\Delta F_c = 2t_z B/\hbar\omega_c \ll \Delta F_\perp \ll F_\beta$ due to the k_z electron dispersion, where we also assume $t_z = \left\langle t_z\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\right\rangle \neq 0$. These two splittings result in four original MQO frequencies $F_\beta \pm \Delta F_\perp \pm \Delta F_c$ of close amplitudes, instead of only two nearby frequencies $F_\beta \pm \Delta F_c$ in organic metals without bilayers[41]. The SlO of MR originate from these four frequencies similarly as in Ref. [41], but result a much richer set of frequencies, as shown below.

At finite temperature the metallic conductivity along i-th axis $\sigma_i = \sigma_{ii}$ is given by the sum of contributions from all ungapped FS pockets β:

$$\sigma_i = \sum_\beta \sigma_{i,\beta} = \sum_\beta e^2 g_{F\beta} D_{i,\beta}. \quad (3)$$

Each pocket β contributes to the total metallic conductivity along axis i at low temperature via the product of a density of electron states (DoS) $g_{F,\beta} = g_\beta\left(\varepsilon = E_F\right)$ and an electron diffusion coefficient $D_{i,\beta}$. Both contribute to oscillations, since they vary with the magnetic field B_z perpendicular to the conducting x-y layers as:

$$\frac{g_{F\beta}}{g_{0\beta}} = 1 + A_\beta \sum_{j,l=\pm1} \cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta + j\Delta F_\perp + l\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right), \quad (4)$$

with $g_{0\beta} = m_\beta^*/\pi\hbar^2 d$ the average DoS at the Fermi level and m_β^* the effective mass for the pocket β, and

$$\frac{D_{i,\beta}}{D_{0i,\beta}} = 1 + B_{i,\beta} \sum_{j,l=\pm1} \cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta + j\Delta F_\perp + l\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right), \quad (5)$$

where the non-oscillating part $D_{0i,\beta}$ of the diffusion coefficient in metals is proportional to the mean-square electron velocity v_i at the Fermi level. The harmonic amplitudes $A_\beta \sim B_{i,\beta}$ contain the Dingle factor[2, 43, 44] $R_{D,\beta} \approx \exp\left(-2\pi\Gamma/\hbar\omega_{c,\beta}\right)$, where the electron level broadening $\Gamma = \Gamma\left(\boldsymbol{B}, T\right)$ comes from various types of interaction of the conducting electrons.[45]

Combining Eqs. (3)-(5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sigma_{i,\beta}}{\sigma_{i,\beta}^{(0)}} &= 1 + \left(A_\beta + B_{i,\beta}\right) \sum_{j,l=\pm1} \cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta + j\Delta F_\perp + l\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right) \\ &+ A_\beta B_{i,\beta} \sum_{j,l,j',l'=\pm1} \cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta + j\Delta F_\perp + l\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right) \times \\ &\times \cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta + j\,j'\Delta F_\perp + l\,l'\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\sigma^{(0)}_{i,\beta} = e^2 g_{0\beta} D_{0i,\beta}$ does not oscillate. The second term in Eq. (6) gives the usual MQO with amplitudes $\sim A_\beta$ and four fundamental frequencies $F_\beta \pm \Delta F_\perp \pm \Delta F_c \sim F_\beta \gg \Delta F_\perp$. The last term in Eq. (6) is of the second order in the amplitude A_β and gives various frequencies: (i) the 4 second harmonics $2\left(F_\beta \pm \Delta F_\perp \pm \Delta F_c\right)$, which are strongly damped by temperature and disorder and can be neglected; (ii) for $j' = 1$ and $l' = -1$ the SlO with very low frequency $2\Delta F_c \ll \Delta F_\perp \ll F_\beta$; (iii) for $j' = -1$ and $l' = \pm 1$ the SlO with intermediate frequencies $2\Delta F_\perp$ and $2\Delta F_\perp \pm 2\Delta F_c$. Indeed, neglecting the high frequency ($\sim 2F_\beta$) contributions we can rewrite the last term in Eq. (6) for $j' = -1$ as

$$\frac{A_\beta B_{i,\beta}}{2} \sum_{j,l,l'=\pm 1} \cos\left(2\pi \frac{2j\Delta F_\perp + l\left(1-l'\right)\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right) = A_\beta B_{i,\beta}\left[2\cos\left(\frac{4\pi\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right) + \sum_{l=\pm 1} \cos\left(4\pi \frac{\Delta F_\perp + l\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\right]. \tag{7}$$

Eqs. (4)-(7) are valid at $4\pi t_z \gg \hbar\omega_c$. At $2t_z \sim \hbar\omega_c$, i.e. when $\Delta F_c \sim B$, the FS warping produces a Bessel's function $J_0\left(4\pi t_z/\hbar\omega_c\right)$ instead of simple frequency splitting $\pm\Delta F_c$. Then instead of (4) the DoS oscillations are given by[53, 55]

$$\frac{g_{F\beta}}{g_{0\beta}} = 1 - \sum_{l=\pm 1} 2J_0\left(2\pi \frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right) \cos\left(2\pi \frac{F_\beta - l\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right) R_D, \tag{8}$$

and similar changes appear in other formulars (5)-(7). Instead of Eq. (7) one then obtains for slow oscillations

$$\sigma_{SlO}\left(B_z\right) \propto J_0^2\left(2\pi \frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right) \cos\left(4\pi \frac{\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right) R_D^2. \tag{9}$$

The Fourier transform (FT) of this magnetic-field dependence of $\sigma_{SlO}\left(B_z\right)$ is shown in Fig. 2. Similar to Eq. (7) it also gives three equidistant harmonics, but the amplitudes of side harmonics (as compared to the amplitude of the central peak) now decreases with the Dingle factor R_D and by reduction of the field interval (see Fig. 1 in [55]) available for Fourier Transformation.

There is an important difference between the SlO with frequency $2\Delta F_c$, produced by FS warping due to k_z dispersion from t_z, and the SlO frequency $2\Delta F_\perp$ from the bilayer splitting $t_\perp$. If due to t_z, the slow frequency has a strongly non-monotonic dependence on the tilt angle of the magnetic field θ:[41, 46]

$$\Delta F_c(\theta) = \Delta F_c(\theta = 0) J_0\left(k_F c^\star \tan\theta\right) / \cos\theta, \tag{10}$$

where $c^\star$ ($= 11.65\mathring{A}$ for YBCO) is the lattice constant in the interlayer z-direction, and k_F is the Fermi momentum. This angular dependence is as for the beat frequency of MQO[41] or as for a square root of interlayer conductivity (AMRO) [47, 48] in a Q2D metal, but differs strongly from the standard cosine dependence

$$F\left(\theta\right) = F\left(\theta = 0\right) / \cos\theta, \tag{11}$$



FIG. 2: (Color online) The FT of SlO of MR given by Eq. (9) at four different Dingle temperatures $\pi T_D/\hbar\omega_c(B_z = 1T) = 1$ (dashed black line), 3 (solid blue line), 5 (dotted red line) and 7 (dash-dotted green line). Insert shows the initial function $\sigma_{SlO}\left(1/B_z\right)$ at $\pi T_D/\hbar\omega_c(B_z = 1T) = 3$.

typical of quasi-2d metals. Eq. (10) has an obvious geometrical interpretation[49]: the slightly warped FS has two extremal cross-sections S_{ext} perpendicular to the magnetic field $\boldsymbol{B}$, which become equal, to first order in t_z, at some tilt angles θ_{Yam}. The SlO frequency $2F_\perp$ due to bilayer splitting, however, has the cosine angular dependence given by Eq. (11) rather than by Eq. (10). To show this, consider a magnetic field that is not very strong, $B \ll F_\alpha \approx 530T$, so $\hbar\omega_c \ll 4\pi t_\perp$ and the field does not modify the electron spectrum of one bilayer. Consider the dispersion in Eq. (2), corresponding to the FS in Fig. 1. At $t_z \ll t_\perp$ the FS consists of two cylinders along z-axis with base areas S_{even} and S_{odd}, differing by $\Delta S = S_{even} - S_{odd} = 4\pi t_\perp m^* = const$. In a tilted magnetic field the two corresponding extremal cross-section areas are $S_{even,odd} = S_{even,odd}/\cos\theta$, leading directly to Eq. (11). The two split FS cylinders are weakly warped at finite interbilayer hopping t_z, but if $2t_z < t_\perp$ and the split FS do not intersect, a finite t_z does not change the angular dependence in Eq. (11) to leading order in $t_z/t_\perp$.

The amplitude of the central frequency $2\Delta F_\perp$ in Eq. (7) is twice as large as the amplitudes of the side frequencies $2\Delta F_\perp \pm 2\Delta F_c$, and in Fig. 2 the amplitudes of side peaks are additionally damped by the finite Dingle factor. This resembles closely the experimental data in YBCO.[5, 18, 22]. We therefore propose an alternative interpretation of the observed [4, 14–21] oscillations at low frequency $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ (and, possibly, in $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$ [37–39]), in which three equidistant harmonics are not due to the small pockets of the FS reconstructed by CDW ordering, as proposed in Refs. [5, 22, 23, 26–30], but rather originate from the mixing according to Eqs. (7) or (9) of four frequencies $F_\beta \pm \Delta F_\perp \pm \Delta F_c$, formed by a fundamental frequency F_β split by bilayer and interbilayer electron hopping integrals $t_\perp$ and t_z. Then, in terms of Eqs. (6)-(9), the frequencies $F_\alpha = 2\Delta F_\perp \approx 530T = 2t_\perp B/\hbar\omega_c$

and $\Delta F = 2\Delta F_c \approx 90T \approx 4t_z B/\hbar\omega_c$ allow to extract the values of bilayer $t_\perp$ and interbilayer t_z average electron transfer integrals from experiment. We summarize arguments in favor of this new interpretation:

(1) Experimentally there are no multiple extra MQO frequencies, which are predicted from FS reconstruction[5, 23, 26–30]. In contrast, the SlO model does not predict additional magnetic oscillations of comparable amplitudes. The only frequency with an amplitude comparable to the amplitude A_β^2 of the side peaks at $F_\alpha \pm \Delta F$ would be $2\Delta F_c \sim 90T$. This low frequency, however, can be detected only at low magnetic field $B_z < \Delta F_c$, where the oscillations are strongly damped by the Dingle factor. In fact such a frequency may have been seen recently.[21] The proposed SlO scenario also predicts a much larger frequency F_β from FS pockets, which should be more easily observed in cyclotron resonance or dHvA than in the Shubnikov-de Haas effect. Experimentally, the $F_\beta \approx 1.65$kT frequency was indeed observed in dHvA [14] and cyclotron resonance [17] measurements, while the $F_\alpha \approx 530$T is much clearer in magnetotransport, in support of its SlO character.

(2) The observed $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ depends very weakly on the degree of doping (see Fig. 4 in Ref. [16] or Fig. 7 in Ref. [17]), consistent with the proposed SlO origin but contradicting the strong doping dependence expected for small FS-pockets.

(3) The bilayer splitting $t_\perp$ expected from band-structure calculations[30, 31] is consistent with the observed SlO frequency F_α: $2\Delta F_\perp = 2t_\perp B/\hbar\omega_c \sim F_\alpha = 530T \approx 2\% \cdot S_{BZ}$, giving[54] $t_\perp \equiv \langle t_\perp(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel)\rangle = \hbar e F_\alpha/2m_\beta^* c \approx 8meV$. Note that the maximum value $t_\perp(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel)$ of bilayer transfer may considerably exceed this average value $t_\perp$. Similarly the observed t_z-induced splitting $2\Delta F_c \approx 90T \sim 4t_z B/\hbar\omega_c$, gives a reasonable average value $2t_z \approx 1.4meV$.

(4) Long-range spatial inhomogeneities, common in cuprates, should strongly damp oscillations from FS pockets due to smearing of the Fermi level.[55] They should affect the proposed SlO much less, making them more easily detectible.[55] In contrast, if one accepts the FS-pocket origin of $F_\alpha \approx 530T$, it is difficult to explain the absence of the corresponding SlO from $t_\perp$ and t_c splitting.

(5) The angular dependence of the observed frequencies[18] corresponds to the SlO interpretation, predicting $F_\alpha(\theta) = 2F_\perp(\theta) \approx const/\cos\theta$ and $\Delta F_c \cos\theta \propto J_0(k_F c^\star \tan\theta)$, where $c^\star \approx 11.8\mathring{A}$ is the interlayer lattice constant. The observed strong angular dependence of the split frequency $\Delta F_c(\theta)$ (see Fig. 4a of Ref. [18]) is well fitted by Eq. (10), corresponding to the FS-warping origin of this splitting. The first Yamaji angle $\theta_{Yam} \approx 43^\circ$ in $\Delta F_c(\theta)$, corresponding to the first zero of the Bessel function $J_0(k_F c^\star \tan\theta)$ in Eq. (10), is clearly seen in Fig. 4a of Ref. [18]. This value corresponds to the FS-pocket area of about $S_{ext} \approx \pi k_F^2 = \pi(2.4/c^\star \tan\theta_{Yam})^2 \approx 15nm^{-2}$ and frequency $F_0 = S_{ext}\hbar c/2\pi e \approx 1.6$kT, which is far from $F_\alpha \approx 530$T but very close to $F_\beta \approx 1.65$kT observed in [14, 17]. Thus we conclude that the FS pocket responsible for the observed MR oscillations, has an area corresponding to $F_\beta \approx 1.65$kT rather than $F_\alpha \approx 530$T, which supports the idea that F_α defines a SlO frequency and $t_\perp$ rather than the area of a reconstructed FS pocket.

(6) An underlying CDW is not a necessary prerequisite for observation of SlO. There are no issues to be resolved as to how a weak and fluctuating CDW ordering could overcome magnetic breakdown, which should be strong for fields up to 100 tesla.

(7) The Fourier transforms of the data are naturally explained without additional fitting parameters (see Fig. 2 or Fig. 1 in Supplementary information [55]).

We now list possible counter-arguments which may require appropriate extension to the theory:

(1) The observed magnetoresistance oscillations are quite strongly damped by temperature, with effective mass $m^\star \approx 1.6m_e$,[16, 18] with m_e the free electron mass, in disagreement with the simple form predicted here[41, 42, 55] but may arise from the square of the Dingle factor R_D (see [55] for more detail) with temperature dependence enhanced by the very strong electron-electron interaction in cuprates.

(2) A component at F_α is also observed in the dHvA effect. This can be due to the electron-electron interaction, which is roughly proportional to the product of the oscillating density of states, giving a nonlinearity in the magnetization oscillations as a functional of the density of states.

(3) Similar slow oscillations with a frequency $\approx 840T$ (but without side-frequency splitting), corresponding to 3% of the Brillouin zone, have been observed in $HgBa_2CuO_{4+\delta}$, where there is no bilayer splitting, but a much larger t_z is expected from the shorter interlayer distance. Whether this frequency has the same origin is as yet unclear.

To summarize, we propose an alternative interpretation of the observed magnetic oscillations with frequencies $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ and $F_\alpha \pm 90T$ in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ high-Tc superconductors, where the F_α is related to the bilayer splitting $t_\perp$ rather than to small FS pocket. This interpretation, relevant to other bilayered quasi-2D conductors, explains the main observations without recourse to charge density waves and Fermi surface reconstruction. The frequencies F_α and $\Delta F_\alpha = 90T$ then allow us to extract the values of bilayer splitting $t_\perp = \hbar e F_\alpha/2m^* c$ and of k_z-dispersion $t_z = \hbar e \Delta F_\alpha/4m^* c$.

The authors thank Ted Forgan for raising this issue and communication of unpublished results. The work was partially supported by RFBR 16-02-00522.

[1] A.A. Abrikosov, *Fundamentals of the theory of metals*, North-Holland, 1988.
[2] Shoenberg D. "Magnetic oscillations in metals", Cambridge University Press 1984.

[3] J. M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1972.

[4] Nicolas Doiron-Leyraud, Cyril Proust, David LeBoeuf, Julien Levallois, Jean-Baptiste Bonnemaison, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, Louis Taillefer, Nature **447**, 565 (2007).

[5] Suchitra E. Sebastian and Cyril Proust, Annu. Rev. Condens.Matter Phys. **6**, 411 (2015).

[6] T. Helm, M. V. Kartsovnik, C. Proust, B. Vignolle, C. Putzke, E. Kampert, I. Sheikin, E.-S. Choi, J. S. Brooks, N. Bittner, W. Biberacher, A. Erb, J. Wosnitza, and R. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 094501 (2015).

[7] Taichi Terashima, Nobuyuki Kurita, Megumi Tomita, Kunihiro Kihou, Chul-Ho Lee, Yasuhide Tomioka, Toshimitsu Ito, Akira Iyo, Hiroshi Eisaki, Tian Liang, Masamichi Nakajima, Shigeyuki Ishida, Shin-ichi Uchida, Hisatomo Harima, and Shinya Uji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 176402 (2011).

[8] D. Graf, R. Stillwell, T. P. Murphy, J.-H. Park, E. C. Palm, P. Schlottmann, R. D. McDonald, J. G. Analytis, I. R. Fisher, and S. W. Tozer, Phys. Rev. B. **85**, 134503 (2012).

[9] Amalia I. Coldea, Daniel Braithwaite, Antony Carrington, Comptes Rendus Physique **14**, 94 (2013).

[10] T. Terashima, N. Kikugawa, A. Kiswandhi, E.-S. Choi, J. S. Brooks, S. Kasahara, T. Watashige, H. Ikeda, T. Shibauchi, Y. Matsuda, T. Wolf, A. E. Böhmer, F. Hardy, C. Meingast, H. v. Löhneysen, M.-T. Suzuki, R. Arita, and S. Uji, Phys. Rev. B. **90**, 144517 (2014).

[11] A. Audouard, F. Duc, L. Drigo, P. Toulemonde, S. Karlsson, P. Strobel, and A. Sulpice, Europhys. Lett. **109**, 27003 (2015).

[12] M. D. Watson, T. K. Kim, A. A. Haghighirad, N. R. Davies, A. McCollam, A. Narayanan, S. F. Blake, Y. L. Chen, S. Ghannadzadeh, A. J. Schofield, M. Hoesch, C. Meingast, T. Wolf, and A. I. Coldea, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 155106 (2015).

[13] M. D. Watson, T. Yamashita, S. Kasahara, W. Knafo, M. Nardone, J. Beard, F. Hardy, A. McCollam, A. Narayanan, S. F. Blake, T. Wolf, A. A. Haghighirad, C. Meingast, A. J. Schofield, H. v. Löhneysen, Y. Matsuda, A. I. Coldea, and T. Shibauchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 027006 (2015).

[14] Suchitra E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, E. Palm, T. P. Murphy, C. H. Mielke, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy and G. G. Lonzarich, Nature 454, 200 (2008)

[15] Alain Audouard, Cyril Jaudet, David Vignolles, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, Louis Taillefer, and Cyril Proust, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 157003 (2009).

[16] John Singleton, Clarina de la Cruz, R. D. McDonald, Shiliang Li, Moaz Altarawneh, Paul Goddard, Isabel Franke, Dwight Rickel, C. H. Mielke, Xin Yao, and Pengcheng Dai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 086403 (2010).

[17] S. E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, M. M. Altarawneh, C. H. Mielke, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, G. G. Lonzarich, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **107**, 6175 (2010).

[18] Suchitra E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, P. A. Goddard, M. M. Altarawneh, C. H. Mielke, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, O. K. Andersen, and G. G. Lonzarich, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 214524 (2010).

[19] Suchitra E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, C. H. Mielke, and G. G. Lonzarich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 196403 (2012).

[20] S.E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, F.F. Balakirev, M.M. Altarawneh, P.A. Goddard et al., Nature **511**, 61 (2014).

[21] N. Doiron-Leyraud, S. Badoux, S. Rene de Cotret, S. Lepault, D. LeBoeuf, F. Laliberte, E. Hassinger, B.J. Ramshaw, D.A. Bonn, W.N. Hardy,R. Liang, J.-H.. Park, D. Vignolles, B. Vignolle, L. Taillefer and C. Proust, Nature Comm. **6**, 6034 (2015).

[22] S. E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, and G. G. Lonzarich, Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 102501 (2012).

[23] Baptiste Vignolle, David Vignolles, Marc-Henri Julien, and Cyril Proust, Comptes Rendus Phys. **14**, 39 (2013).

[24] T. Helm, M.V. Kartsovnik, M. Bartkowiak, N. Bittner, M. Lambacher, A. Erb, J. Wosnitza, and R. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 157002 (2009).

[25] T. Helm, M.V. Kartsovnik, I. Sheikin, M. Bartkowiak, F. Wolff-Fabris, N. Bittner, W. Biberacher, M. Lambacher, A. Erb, J. Wosnitza, and R. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 247002 (2010).

[26] I. S. Elfimov, G. A. Sawatzky, and A. Damascelli, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 060504(R) (2008).

[27] David Garcia-Aldea and Sudip Chakravarty, New Journal of Physics **12**, 105005 (2010).

[28] N. Harrison and S. E. Sebastian, New Journal of Physics **14**, 095023 (2012).

[29] N. Harrison, B. J. Ramshaw and A. Shekhter, Scientific Reports **5**, 10914 (2015).

[30] A. Briffa, E. Blackburn, S. M. Hayden, E. A. Yelland, M. W. Long, and E. M. Forgan, arXiv:1510.02603.

[31] O. K. Andersen, A.I. Liechtenstein, O. Jepsen, F. Paulsen, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 56, 1573 (1995).

[32] G. Ghiringhelli, M. Le Tacon, M. Minola, S. Blanco-Canosa, C. Mazzoli, N. Brookes, G. De Luca, A. Frano, D. Hawthorn, F. He et al., Science **337**, 821 (2012).

[33] J. Chang, E. Blackburn, A. Holmes, N. Christensen, J. Larsen, J. Mesot, R. Liang, D. Bonn, W. Hardy, A. Watenphul et al., Nat. Phys. **8**, 871 (2012).

[34] A. J. Achkar, R. Sutarto, X. Mao, F. He, A. Frano, S. Blanco-Canosa, M. Le Tacon, G. Ghiringhelli, L. Braicovich, M. Minola, M. Moretti Sala, C. Mazzoli, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, B. Keimer, G. A. Sawatzky, and D. G. Hawthorn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 167001 (2012).

[35] T. Wu, H. Mayaffre, S. Krämer, M. Horvatic, C. Berthier, W. Hardy, R. Liang, D. Bonn, andM.-H. Julien, Nature (London) **477**, 191 (2011).

[36] T. Wu, H. Mayaffre, S. Kräamer, M. Horvatic, C. Berthier, W. Hardy, R. Liang, D. Bonn, and M.-H. Julien, Nat. Commun. **6**, 6438 (2015)..

[37] E. A. Yelland, J. Singleton, C. H. Mielke, N. Harrison, F. F. Balakirev, B. Dabrowski, and J. R. Cooper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 047003 (2008).

[38] A. F. Bangura, J. D. Fletcher, A. Carrington, J. Levallois, M. Nardone, B. Vignolle, P. J. Heard, N. Doiron-Leyraud, D. LeBoeuf, L. Taillefer, S. Adachi, C. Proust, and N. E. Hussey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 047004 (2008).

[39] B. S. Tan, N. Harrison, Z. Zhu, F. Balakirev, B. J. Ramshaw, A. Srivastava, S. A. Sabok-Sayr, B. Dabrowski, G. G. Lonzarich, and Suchitra E. Sebastian, PNAS 112, 9568 (2015).

[40] B. Vignolle, A. Carrington, R. A. Cooper, M. M. J. French, A. P. Mackenzie, C. Jaudet, D. Vignolles, Cyril Proust & N. E. Hussey, Nature **455**, 952 (2008).

[41] M.V. Kartsovnik, P.D. Grigoriev, W. Biberacher, N.D. Kushch, P. Wyder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 126802 (2002).

[42] P.D. Grigoriev, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 144401 (2003) [arXiv:cond-mat/0204270].

[43] R.B. Dingle, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A211,** 517 (1952).

[44] Yu. A. Bychkov, Zh. Exp. Theor. Phys. **39**, 1401 (1960), [Sov. Phys. JETP **12**, 977 (1961)].

[45] The amplitudes $A_\beta, B_{i,\beta}$ may also contain the magnetic-breakdown damping factors[2] if there are FS pockets close in momentum space, as is the case for FS reconstruction by a CDW.
[46] Eq. (10) assumes that $t_z\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right) \approx const$. When $t_z\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)$ has a strong angular dependence, Eq. (10) modifies,[51, 52] remaining the oscillating function of $k_F c^\star \tan\theta$.
[47] M.V. Kartsovnik, P. A. Kononovich , V. N. Laukhin and I. F. Shchegolev, JETP Lett. **48**, 541 (1988).
[48] R. Yagi, Y. Iye, T. Osada, S. Kagoshima, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59**, 3069 (1990).
[49] K. Yamaji, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **58**, 1520 (1989).
[50] M. V. Kartsovnik, V. N. Laukhin, S. I. Pesotskii, I. F. Schegolev, V. M. Yakovenko, J. Phys. I **2**, 89 (1992).
[51] C. Bergemann, S. R. Julian, A. P. Mackenzie, S. NishiZaki, and Y. Maeno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2662 (2000).
[52] P.D. Grigoriev, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 205122 (2010).
[53] V. M. Gvozdikov, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) 26, 2574 (1984) [Sov. Phys. Solid State 26, 1560 (1984)]; T. Champel and V. P. Mineev, Phil. Magazine B **81**, 55 (2001).
[54] We take $bm^*_\beta \approx 3.8m_e$ as obtained from dHvA measurements for β-frequency,[14] because within our model $m^*_\alpha \approx 1.6m_e$ is not a true effective electron mass but rather an effective parameter coming from the temperature dependence of the square of Dingle temperature.[55]
[55] See supplementary materials.

arXiv:1606.03942v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 13 Jun 2016

Supplementary Information on Slow quantum oscillations without Fermi Surface Reconstruction in Cuprate Superconductors

P.D. Grigoriev[1,2] and Timothy Ziman[3,4]

[1] *L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, 142432 Chernogolovka, Russia*
[2] *National University of Science and Technology "MISiS", Moscow 119049, Russia*
[3] *Institut Laue-Langevin, BP 156, 41 Avenue des Martyrs, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*
[4] *LPMMC (UMR 5493), Université de Grenobles-Alpes and CNRS, Maison des Magistères, BP 166, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*

MAGNETORESISTANCE OSCILLATIONS IN QUASI-2D METAL WITH BILAYER CRYSTAL STRUCTURE

In a single-band, quasi-2-dimensional metal without bilayer splitting with only one cylindrical Fermi Surface and an electron dispersion

$$\epsilon\left(k_z,\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\approx\epsilon_\parallel\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)-2t_z\cos\left(k_zc^\star\right), \tag{1}$$

the corresponding oscillating density of electron states (DoS) is given by[1]

$$\frac{g_{F\beta}}{g_{0\beta}}=1-2J_0\left(\frac{4\pi t_z}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\cos\left(\frac{2\pi\varepsilon}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)R_D, \tag{2}$$

where $g_{0\beta}=m^*_\beta/\pi\hbar^2d$ is the average DoS at the Fermi level, $J_0\left(x\right)$ is the Bessel's function, and R_D is the Dingle factor.[2] The DoS at the Fermi level is found by making the subsititution $\varepsilon\to\mu$, where $\mu=E_F$ is the chemical potential. Introducing the magnetic quantum oscillation frequency $F_\beta=\mu B_z/\hbar\omega_c$, we rewrite Eq. (2) as

$$\frac{g_{F\beta}}{g_{0\beta}}=1-2J_0\left(2\pi\frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta}{B_z}\right)R_D. \tag{3}$$

For an electron dispersion is split by a bilayer geometry

$$\epsilon_\pm\left(k_z,\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\approx\epsilon_\parallel\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\pm t_\perp\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\pm 2t_z\left(\boldsymbol{k}_\parallel\right)\cos\left[k_z\left(h+d\right)\right] \tag{4}$$

the DoS is

$$\frac{g_{F\beta}}{g_{0\beta}}=1-\sum_{l=\pm1}2J_0\left(2\pi\frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta-l\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right)R_D. \tag{5}$$

The diffusion coefficient $D_{i,\beta}$ depends on its direction i with respect to magnetic field and to the crystal axes. However, its oscillations can be approximated by Eq. (5) or by

$$\frac{D_{i,\beta}}{D_{0i,\beta}}\approx1-B_{i,\beta}J_0\left(2\pi\frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\sum_{l=\pm1}\cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta-l\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right)R_D, \tag{6}$$

where the coefficients $B_{i,\beta}\sim1$ depend on the direction i. For $i\parallel z$ and without bilayer splitting it was calculated in Ref. [4].

The slow oscillations (SlO) with frequency $\sim2\Delta F_\perp$ come from the frequency mixing, which is best illustrated by considering the product of the two oscillating quantities [see Eq. (7) of the main text]

$$P=\left[1-2J_0\left(2\pi\frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta-\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right)R_D\right] \tag{7}$$

$$\times\left[1-2J_0\left(2\pi\frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta+\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right)R_D\right], \tag{8}$$

which, after neglecting the second harmonic, gives

$$P\left(B_z\right)\approx1-2\left[J_0\left(2\pi\frac{\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\right]^2\cos\left(4\pi\frac{\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right)R_D^2. \tag{9}$$

The second term in this formula produces the SlO in Eq. (9) of the main text. Applying the asymptotic expansion of the Bessel's function at large arguments, $J_0(x)\approx\sqrt{2/\pi x}\cos\left(x-\pi/4\right)$, we arrive at Eq. (7) of the main text. For high magnetic fields $B_z\sim\Delta F_c\approx45T$, however, we should use the Bessel's function itself instead of its asymptotic expansion. The function $P\left(B_z\right)$ in Eq. (9) also has a Fourier transform containing one main peak at $2\Delta F_\perp$ and two smaller peaks at $2\Delta F_\perp\pm2\Delta F_c$, but the shape of this 3-peak structure depends on the Dingle temperature (see Fig. 2 in the main text) or on the field interval of the available experimental data where this Fourier transform is taken (see Fig. 1).

To model the experimental observations in $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ without specifying the Dingle temperature and to emphasize the dependence on the field interval we have just mentioned, we take $2\Delta F_\perp=530T$ and $2\Delta F_c=90T$ and calculate the Fourier transform (FT) of the function in Eq. (9) for $R_D=1$ within different field intervals. The results are given in Fig. 1 and show how the 3-peak frequency pattern of MQO becomes smoother and finally disappears (collapses into only one broad peak) as the field interval of the transform is reduced. In experiments, the interval of Fourier Transformation is limited from the high-field side by the available magnetic field equipment, and from the low-field side by the amplitude of the magnetic quantum oscillations (MQO). In real compounds with decreasing B_z the amplitude of the MQO decreases faster than in Fig. 1 where we take $R_D=1$. In $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$ the oscillations become observable for B_z exceeding $20-30$



FIG. 1: (Color online) (a) The function $P(B_z)$ in Eq. (9) at $R_D = 1$ and (b) its Fourier Transform in the field intervals $20T < B_z < 100T$ (solid black line), $20T < B_z < 65T$ (dashed green line), $25T < B_z < 65T$ (dash-dotted blue line), and $30T < B_z < 65T$ (dotted red line).

Tesla, while the highest fields currently available are in the range $H_{max} \sim 65 - 100$T , depending on the facilities. From Fig. 1 one sees that even a very simple model, given by Eq. (9) gives a very good agreement with the Fourier transform of the experimental magnetic quantum oscillations.

TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF SLOW MAGNETORESISTANCE OSCILLATIONS

At finite temperature T the conductivity is

$$\sigma_{ij}(T) = \int d\varepsilon \left[-n'_F(\varepsilon)\right] \sigma_{ij}(\varepsilon), \tag{10}$$

where the derivative of the Fermi distribution function $n'_F(\varepsilon) = -1/\{4T\cosh^2[(\varepsilon-\mu)/2T]\}$, and $\sigma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$ is the component of the electron conductivity tensor at energy ε. Usual magnetic oscillation come from the terms as $g_{F\beta}(\varepsilon)/g_{0\beta}$, which oscillate rapidly as a function of energy ε:

$$\sigma_1(\varepsilon) \propto 1 - 2J_0\left(\frac{4\pi t_z}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{\varepsilon \pm t_\perp}{\hbar\omega_c}\right) R_D. \tag{11}$$

Substituting Eq. (11) into Eq. (10) and performing the integration over ε, one obtains the well-known result that at finite temperature the MQO are damped by the factor

$$R_T = \left(2\pi^2 k_B T/\hbar\omega_c\right)/\sinh\left(2\pi^2 k_B T/\hbar\omega_c\right), \tag{12}$$

which gives

$$\sigma_1(\mu) \propto 1 - 2J_0\left(\frac{4\pi t_z}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{\mu \pm t_\perp}{\hbar\omega_c}\right) R_D R_T \tag{13}$$

$$= 1 - 2J_0\left(\frac{2\pi\Delta F_c}{B_z}\right)\sum_{l=\pm1}\cos\left(2\pi\frac{F_\beta - l\Delta F_\perp}{B_z}\right) R_D R_T.$$

The slow oscillations come from the product of oscillating quantities, such as $\left(g_{F\beta}(\varepsilon)/g_{0\beta}\right)^2$, which for bilayer-splitted electron dispersion in Eq. (4) in the second order in R_D gives

$$\sigma_2(\varepsilon) \propto 4J_0^2\left(\frac{4\pi t_z}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{\varepsilon - t_\perp}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\cos\left(2\pi\frac{\varepsilon + t_\perp}{\hbar\omega_c}\right) R_D^2$$

$$= 2J_0^2\left(\frac{4\pi t_z}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\left[\cos\left(\frac{4\pi\varepsilon}{\hbar\omega_c}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{4\pi t_\perp}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\right] R_D^2. \tag{14}$$

The first term in the square brackets gives the second harmonic of MQO, which is strongly damped by temperature by the factor close to the square of R_T in Eq. (12) similarly to the first harmonic. The second term in the square brackets of Eq. (14), responsible for SlO, is independent of temperature. Therefore, its integration over ε with $n'_F(\varepsilon)$ in Eq. (10) does not produce any temperature damping factor for SlO:

$$\sigma_2(\mu) \propto J_0^2\left(\frac{4\pi t_z}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\left[\cos\left(\frac{4\pi\mu}{\hbar\omega_c}\right) R_T^2 + \cos\left(\frac{4\pi t_\perp}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\right] R_D^2. \tag{15}$$

Thus, within this simplest model, the SlO are not damped by temperature, as seen in the observed slow oscillations in Refs. [3, 4]. However, magnetio-resistance oscillations observed at frequency $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ have some temperature damping, corresponding to an effective mass of $m^\star \approx 1.6m_e$.[5–7] Such a strong temperature damping of what are proposed by us as being slow oscillations may arise from the square of the temperature-dependent Dingle factor R_D.[8] For non-interacting electrons, when the Dingle factor comes only from impurity scattering, R_D is almost temperature independent. A weak electron-phonon interaction was also predicted[9] not to violate the usual $R_T(T)$ to the lowest-order perturbation theory, but for YBCO at $T \sim 10$K the electron-phonon interaction is not weak, and the result of Ref. [9] may not apply. In addition, the electron-electron interaction, which in cuprates is very strong, gives considerable temperature dependence to R_D, as observed experimentally

and may contribute to the measured effective electron mass $m^\star \approx 1.6 m_e$. Note that the extracted effective mass depends strongly on doping outside the doping interval $0.1 < p < 0.125$,[5] and this would reflect the doping dependence of the strength of e-e interactions.

Similarly one can explain the fact that the slow oscillations with frequency $F_\alpha \approx 530T$ are observed also in dHvA effect, which again contradicts the simple model above and that of Refs. [3, 4]. If the electron-electron interaction is included, its effects are roughly proportional to the product of the oscillating density of states (DoS), and it should produce a nonlinearity in the magnetic oscillations of magnetization (or of other thermodynamic quantities) as a functional of the density of states. This nonlinearity results in slow oscillations of thermodynamic quantities such as magnetization, similar to those of the magneto-resistance.

[1] V. M. Gvozdikov, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) 26, 2574 (1984) [Sov. Phys. Solid State 26, 1560 (1984)]; T. Champel and V. P. Mineev, Phil. Magazine B **81**, 55 (2001).

[2] Shoenberg D. "Magnetic oscillations in metals", Cambridge University Press 1984.

[3] M.V. Kartsovnik, P.D. Grigoriev, W. Biberacher, N.D. Kushch, P. Wyder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 126802 (2002).

[4] P.D. Grigoriev, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 144401 (2003) [arXiv:cond-mat/0204270].

[5] John Singleton, Clarina de la Cruz, R. D. McDonald, Shiliang Li, Moaz Altarawneh, Paul Goddard, Isabel Franke, Dwight Rickel, C. H. Mielke, Xin Yao, and Pengcheng Dai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 086403 (2010).

[6] Suchitra E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, P. A. Goddard, M. M. Altarawneh, C. H. Mielke, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, O. K. Andersen, and G. G. Lonzarich, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 214524 (2010).

[7] An excellent fit of experimental data by the temperature damping factor R_T of the Lifshitz-Kosevich formula has been achieved (see Fig. 6c in Ref. [10]), at least for one doping level $p \approx 0.108$ over a wide temperature interval $1K < T < 16$K. Such a good fit is atypical even for materials which are much cleaner and have stoichiometric chemical composition and almost ideal crystal structure. In any case, the temperature-dependent Dingle factor due to e-e interactions in YBCO should spoil the ideal dependence $R_T(T)$, which in Fig. 6c in Ref. [10] survived even up to $T = 16$K. Therefore, we believe that the quality of the fit may be accidental.

[8] The electron level broadening Γ is related to the Dingle temperature $T_D = \Gamma/k_B$ and to the effective electron mean free time $\tau = \hbar/2\Gamma$. Usually, at low temperatures one takes into account only electron scattering by impurities, which gives a temperature-independent Dingle factor. The contribution to T_D from electron-electron (e-e) and electron-phonon (e-ph) increases with temperature and may be confused with the damping factor coming from temperature R_T, thus leading to the incorrect estimate of the effective mass from the oscillations. While in the lowest order of perturbation theory the electron-phonon contributions to T_D and to m^* were shown[2, 9] to compensate each other, the electron-electron contribution to T_D in disordered metals needs further theoretical study.

[9] S. Engelsberg and G. Simpson, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 1657 (1970).

[10] Suchitra E. Sebastian and Cyril Proust, Annu. Rev. Condens.Matter Phys. **6**, 411 (2015).